

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 29 2007

Serial No. 09/988,965

Page 10 of 14

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending in the present application. Applicants amend claim 10 for clarification. No new matter has been added.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner indicate acceptance of the drawings.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the Examiner's allowance of claims 1-9 and 11, and respectfully submit that the provided reasons for allowance include only the Examiner's non-exhaustive interpretations—which should in no way limit the scope of the allowed claims.

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,049,524 to Fukushima et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,198,722 to Bunch. Applicants amend claim 10 in a good faith effort to clarify the invention as distinguished from the cited references, and respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Examiner conceded that Fukushima et al. fail to disclose the claimed means for transmitting, and relied upon Bunch as a combining reference that allegedly discloses this feature.

Bunch states that

“[i]f FC_gap_timer has not expired when FCS 620 receives send_fc_msg(X)=true while in NO FLOW Control state 710, then FCS 620 transitions to Flow Control Halt state 740 and waits with port_transmit=IDLE on port(X) 630 so that end station 640 observes a sufficient interframe gap in transmission activity,” on col. 15, lines 31-36.

The Flow control Halt state 740 waits with port_transmit=IDLE on port(X) 630. That is, the Flow control Halt halts flow control of an end station.

R4189745_1

Serial No. 09/988,965

Page 11 of 14

Accordingly, the "halt" described in Bunch is different from a process relating to routing including a transmission of information on a route of a router and routing processing of a received packet, as claimed.

The message "port_transmit=IDLE" is transmitted to end station from a central node in the Flow control Halt 740. Thus, such portions of Bunch do not disclose the claimed feature of a router reporting a change to adjacent routers.

Bunch states that, "SRM 830 determines that the node MAC 810 should be flow controlled and passes send_fc_msg(X)=true to port 820," on col. 16, lines 7-9.

Accordingly, a time when the message "send_fc_msg(X)=true" is transmitted is when MAC 810 should be flow controlled, and is not when the process relating to routing including a transmission of said information on a route of said router and routing processing of a received packet is temporarily halted, as claimed.

Accordingly, it would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Fukushima et al. and Bunch in the manner proposed by the Examiner in that the cited portions of Bunch (e.g., col. 15, lines 31-36) fail to disclose or suggest incorporating the claimed means for reporting of claim 10.

Bunch describes on col. 18, lines 33-39, "halting the transmission of the first signal such that a time duration of the transmission of the first signal less than the first time period of the medium access control protocol, wherein the medium access control protocol requires the end station to wait for at least a second time period before committing to transmitting data onto the communication medium."

84189745_1

Serial No. 09/988,965

Page 12 of 14

The halt described in such portions of Bunch is a halt of the transmission of a first signal, and is not a halt of a process relating to routing including a transmission of the information on a route of said router and routing processing of a received packet.

Accordingly, Bunch, as cited and relied upon by the Examiner, (col. 18, lines 33-39) fails to disclose the claimed means for reporting of claim 10.

Bunch also describes on col. 8, lines 34-38, "wherein the flow control means will command the port to halt the transmission of the first signal if the flow control signal remains active such that the duration of the transmission of the first signal is less than the first period of time." However, the first signal of which the transmission is being halted in Bunch is a signal for flow control, and is not a message for reporting a change in information on a route.

Furthermore, Bunch describes halting the transmission of the first signal if the flow control signal remains active, and the flow control signal is different from a message for a process relating to routing of an adjacent router being temporarily halted.

Additionally, Bunch only describes a central node including flow control means for an end station, where the central node and end station are of different types. And the cited portions of Bunch, therefore, do not disclose the claimed feature of a router informing adjacent routers.

Accordingly, Bunch, as cited and relied upon by the Examiner, (col. 8, lines 33-39) fails to disclose the claimed means for transmitting of claim 10.

In other words, even assuming, arguendo, that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Fukushima et al. and Bunch, such a combination would still have failed to disclose or suggest,

"[a] router comprising:
means for reporting a change in information on a route
involving a particular adjacent router to adjacent routers other than

84189745_1

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Serial No. 09/988,965

Page 13 of 14

said particular adjacent router when information on a route has not been received from said particular adjacent router for at least a predetermined period of time;

means for transmitting a message to adjacent routers to inform said adjacent routers that a process relating to routing of said router is temporarily halted when said process relating to routing including a transmission of said information on a route of said router and routing processing of a received packet are temporarily halted; and

means for temporarily halting a process to report a change in information on a route involving a particular adjacent router to adjacent routers other than said particular adjacent router when said message is received from said particular adjacent router even if information on a route has not been received from said particular adjacent router for at least a predetermined period of time," as recited in claim 10. (Emphasis added)

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10 is patentable over Fukushima et al. and Bunch, separately and in combination, for at least the foregoing reasons.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's implicit finding that the additional references made of record, but not applied, do not render the claims of the present application unpatentable, whether these references are considered alone or in combination with others.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.


84189745_1

Serial No. 09/988,965

Page 14 of 14

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,



Dexter T. Chang
Reg. No. 44,071

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304

Telephone: (212) 940-6384

Fax: (212) 940-8986 or 8987

Docket No.: 100794-00080 (FUJM 19.166)

DTC:bf

84189745_1